



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*Lecanactis Salicina* A. Zahlbruckner, sp. nov. in litt. Conspicuously distinguished by a densely white pruinose disk. On *Salix lasiolepis*, Rustic Cañon, Santa Monica Mts. Sawtelle, California.

### A NOMENCLATURE NOTE.

JOHN M. HOLZINGER.

The vicissitudes of scientific names are curiously illustrated by the way *Homalotheciella subcapillata* (Hedw.) Card. (1904) came to displace *Burnettia subcapillata* (Hedw.) Grout (1903). When the writer chose the former generic name for the D. C. moss published in the September, 1907, BRYOLOGIST, he considered as correct Mr. Cardot's contention in THE BRYOLOGIST of March, 1904. And the statement in Dr. Sudworth's published comments (l.c. p. 91) that "Grout's position in passing over these two section names of Cardot's is unsupported, etc." seemed also eminently fair and correct. The correspondence brought on by this publication, however, has, together with repeated study of the Vienna Code, led to a different conclusion.

It appears that it was Dr. Grout's discovery that *Homalothecium* is not tenable. He therefore published *Burnettia* in July, 1903 (BRYOLOGIST, p. 65). At the time of this publication this author was not aware that Mr. Cardot had, in 1899, four years before, established two sections of the genus *Homalothecium*; *Homalotheciella*, and *Euhomalothecium* (Bull. Herb. Boiss. Vol. 7, p. 374). And even had he known of Mr. Cardot's section names, Dr. Grout was not compelled, by any rule in the Code of Vienna at least, to adopt *Homalotheciella* in place of *Homalothecium*. This of course is indicated only in Recommendations XXIX, p. 47, of that Code. It must therefore be admitted that he was quite within his right as author to establish *Burnettia*. And, according to the Vienna Code it seems that, other things being equal, *Burnettia* would stand even against Mr. Cardot's contention on behalf of his own first section name superceding *Homalothecium*, in THE BRYOLOGIST, March, 1904. In corroboration of this, note the first example under Art. 49, p. 48, where the section *Campanopsis* R. Br. (1810) of the genus *Campanula* was in 1814 first raised to generic rank by Schrader, who called the genus thus split off *Wahlenbergia*; it helped Mr. Otto Kuntz not a bit to resuscitate Robert Brown's *Campanopsis*. This author had used *Campanopsis* surely not as a generic name. Thus Schrader's is the first generic name really published, and so stands, although published four years later than "Campanopsis."

Here, however, the parallelism ends. For, correspondence has unearthed the fact that *Burnettia* Grout is antedated by over fifty years by *Burnettia* Lindb., for a genus of Orchids, and "has been in continuous use ever since." The next earliest tenable name published for *Homalothecium* as a genus name is, therefore, *Homalotheciella* Cardot, 1904; this is because *Burnettia* 1903 was preoccupied, not because Mr. Cardot's argument was right.

Curiously, in this little quadrangular affair, every one involved appears to have been partly wrong. At least the writer cheerfully confesses himself to have been in error as herein stated.

Winona, Minn.